

### REMARKS

The Patent Office finds the reply filed September 25, 2007, unresponsive because Applicant amended the pending claims to describe an electroless process rather than an electrochemical process. Applicant believes the Patent Office conclusion is unwarranted since an electroless process is an electrochemical process. In other words, electrochemical reactions may be produced by application of an electrical current (electrolysis) or may proceed spontaneously (electroless). Both reactions are oxidation-reduction (REDOX) reactions. One applies electric current to produce the reaction, the other may generate an electric current (e.g., a voltaic cell).

Applicant respectfully requests that the Patent Office withdraw its conclusion that the prior response was non-responsive.

### CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that all claims now pending patentably define the subject invention over the prior art of record and are in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited at the earliest possible date.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17, particularly extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN, LLP

Dated: \_\_\_\_\_

1/14/08

William T. Babbitt

William Thomas Babbitt, Reg. No. 39,591

1279 Oakmead Parkway  
Sunnyvale, California 94085-4040  
Telephone (310) 207-3800  
Facsimile (408) 720-8383

### **CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being submitted electronically via EFS Web on the date shown below to the United States Patent and Trademark Office.

Nedy Caldeon

Nedy Caldeon

1/14/08

Date